

1 Matthew S. Warren (State Bar No. 230565)
2 Erika H. Warren (State Bar No. 295570)
22-3892@cases.warrenkashwarren.com
3 WARREN KASH WARREN LLP
2261 Market Street, No. 606
San Francisco, California, 94114
4 Tel: (415) 895-2940
Fax: (415) 895-2964

5 David I. Berl (*pro hac vice*)
6 Adam D. Harber (*pro hac vice*)
7 Elise M. Baumgarten (*pro hac vice*)
Melissa B. Collins (*pro hac vice*)
8 D. Shayon Ghosh (State Bar No. 313628)
Arthur John Argall III (*pro hac vice*)
9 Andrew G. Borrasso (*pro hac vice*)
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
680 Maine Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C., 20024
Tel: (202) 434-5000
Fax: (202) 434-5029

12 Counsel for Plaintiffs Gentex Corporation
and Indigo Technologies, LLC

Ellisen Shelton Turner (SBN #224842)
Joshua Glucoft (SBN #301249)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
2049 Century Park East, Suite 3700
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 552-4200
Fax: (310) 552-5900
ellisen.turner@kirkland.com
josh.glucoft@kirkland.com

Akshay S. Deoras (SBN #301962)
Yan-Xin Li (SBN #332329)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel: (415) 439-1400
Fax: (415) 439-1500
akshay.deoras@kirkland.com
yanxin.li@kirkland.com

Jeanne M. Heffernan (admitted *pro hac vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
401 Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
Tel: (512) 678-9100
Fax: (512) 678-9101
jheffernan@kirkland.com

Counsel for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc.
and Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC

[Additional counsel listed on signature page]

15
16
17 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
19 OAKLAND DIVISION

20 GENTEX CORPORATION and INDIGO
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 THALES VISIONIX, INC.,

23 Involuntary Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 META PLATFORMS, INC. and META
PLATFORMS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

26 Defendants.

27 Case No. 4:22-cv-03892-YGR

28 **JOINT MOTION TO DISMISS**

REDACTED

Date: February 20, 2024
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Courtroom 1, 4th Floor
Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on February 20, 2024, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as
 3 it may be heard, in the courtroom of Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, located at Oakland
 4 Courthouse, Courtroom 1, 4th Floor, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California 94612, voluntary plaintiffs
 5 Gentex Corporation (“**Gentex**”) and Indigo Technologies, LLC (“**Indigo**”) (collectively, “**Plaintiffs**”)
 6 and defendants Meta Platforms, Inc. and Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC (collectively,
 7 “**Defendants**” or “**Meta**”), will and do now jointly move pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
 8 41(a)(2) to dismiss with prejudice this action for patent infringement.

9 Plaintiffs and Defendants have entered into a settlement agreement (the “**Agreement**”) that
 10 includes, among other things, a full release and covenant not to sue from Plaintiffs regarding the
 11 patents-in-suit. Ex. A at II.1 & II.2. A copy of the Agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. In the
 12 Agreement, Plaintiffs and Defendants further agree that this action should be dismissed with prejudice
 13 in its entirety. Ex. A at II.4 (See “Dismissals” clause). The Agreement [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED] December 21, 2023 Term Sheet attached hereto as **Exhibit B** (the “**Term**
 15 **Sheet**”).

16 Involuntary Plaintiff Thales Visionix, Inc. (“**Thales**”) is also a party to the Term Sheet and
 17 agreed to all of its terms. Thales’ Chief Operating Officer signed the Term Sheet, which includes [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]. Ex. B at 4, 6. All parties to the Term Sheet, including Thales, agreed
 20 to dismiss this action with prejudice.¹ Despite executing the Term Sheet, Thales now refuses to add
 21 its signature to a Rule 41(a)(1)(ii) stipulation dismissing this action. Instead, after the Term Sheet was
 22 duly executed by all parties, Thales sent an email purporting to unilaterally void its signature and
 23 rescind the entire Term Sheet. Thales also now opposes this motion to dismiss, although it has offered
 24 no legal basis for maintaining the action or any claims therein. Thus, Plaintiffs and Defendants have
 25 been forced to file this opposed joint motion rather than a stipulation.

26

27 ¹ The Agreement is between Gentex, Indigo, and Meta; [REDACTED]

28 [REDACTED] Ex. A at IV.5.

1 Thales has no legitimate basis to oppose dismissal. Even to the extent Thales takes issue with
 2 the validity of the Term Sheet or any impact it may have on Thales, those issues are irrelevant to the
 3 claims and defenses in this action, and neither permit maintaining nor provide reason to maintain this
 4 action. Gentex is the exclusive field-of-use licensee of all of the patents-in-suit (and Indigo is the
 5 former exclusive field-of-use licensee). Gentex, not Thales, asserted all of the claims in this action.
 6 Thales was joined involuntarily as a plaintiff as the assignee of the patents, pursuant only to its
 7 contractual obligation to participate in an action for patent infringement brought by Gentex. Thales
 8 did not sign the Complaint, ECF No. 1, at 39, did not serve any Rule 26(a)(1) initial disclosures, and
 9 did not serve infringement or damages contentions. Thales provided verified interrogatory responses
 10 in which, [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]. Ex. C at 20, 27 (“[REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED”); *see also id.* at 25 (“[REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED.”). Thales also confirmed that [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED] *Id.* at 24.

16 Whatever dispute Thales may now wish to raise about the specifics of the parties’ settlement
 17 Term Sheet, or any of Thales’ obligations under it, has no bearing on the rights Plaintiffs granted to
 18 Meta in the Agreement or the claims Plaintiffs asserted in this litigation. Thales has not disputed, and
 19 cannot dispute, that Plaintiffs can grant, and have granted, to Meta, among other things (1) a full
 20 release of Plaintiffs’ claims in this action, and (2) a covenant not to sue, [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]. Ex. A at II.1 & II.2; Ex. B at 2, 3. Those
 22 granted rights are alone sufficient to dismiss this action with prejudice and to deprive the Court of
 23 subject-matter jurisdiction over all pending claims.² There are no counterclaims. Thus, Plaintiffs and
 24 Meta have settled all of their disputes in this action through the Agreement, which is mutually binding
 25 on them, and the Agreement requires dismissal of this action with prejudice. Therefore, there is no
 26

27 ² See, e.g., *Dow Jones & Co., Inc. v. Ablaise Ltd.*, 606 F.3d 1338, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (concluding
 28 covenant not to sue extinguished any current or future case or controversy between the parties and
 divested the district court of subject matter jurisdiction).

1 basis to delay timely dismissal with prejudice, whether due to the Agreement (as required) or because
2 the only parties with any pending claims in this action have mutually agreed to its dismissal with
3 prejudice.

4 Accordingly, Plaintiffs and Defendants respectfully request that this action be dismissed with
5 prejudice and the case be closed.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: January 12, 2024

2 /s/ Adam D. Harber

3 Matthew S. Warren (State Bar No. 230565)
4 Erika H. Warren (State Bar No. 295570)
5 22-3892@cases.warrenkashwarren.com
6 WARREN KASH WARREN LLP
7 2261 Market Street, No. 606
8 San Francisco, California, 94114
9 Tel: (415) 895-2940
10 Fax: (415) 895-2964

11 David I. Berl (*pro hac vice*)
12 Adam D. Harber (*pro hac vice*)
13 Elise M. Baumgarten (*pro hac vice*)
14 Melissa B. Collins (*pro hac vice*)
15 D. Shayon Ghosh (State Bar No. 313628)
16 Arthur John Argall III (*pro hac vice*)
17 Andrew G. Borrasso (*pro hac vice*)
18 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
19 680 Maine Avenue S.W.
20 Washington, D.C., 20024
21 Tel: (202) 434-5000
22 Fax: (202) 434-5029

23 *Counsel for Plaintiffs Gentex Corporation*
24 and *Indigo Technologies, LLC*

Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ Ellisen Shelton Turner

3 Ellisen Shelton Turner (SBN #224842)
4 Joshua Glucoft (SBN #301249)
5 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
6 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3700
7 Los Angeles, CA 90067
8 Tel: (310) 552-4200
9 Fax: (310) 552-5900
10 ellisen.turner@kirkland.com
11 josh.glucoft@kirkland.com

12 Akshay S. Deoras (SBN #301962)
13 Yan-Xin Li (SBN #332329)
14 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
15 555 California Street
16 San Francisco, CA 94104
17 Tel: (415) 439-1400
18 Fax: (415) 439-1500
19 akshay.deoras@kirkland.com
20 yanxin.li@kirkland.com

21 Jeanne M. Heffernan (admitted *pro hac vice*)
22 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
23 401 Congress Avenue
24 Austin, TX 78701
25 Tel: (512) 678-9100
26 Fax: (512) 678-9101
27 jheffernan@kirkland.com

28 Yimeng Dou (SBN #285248)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 South Flower Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: (213) 680-8400
Fax: (213) 680-8500
yimeng.dou@kirkland.com

2 *Counsel for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc.*
3 and *Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC*

SIGNATURE ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the other signatories.

Dated: January 12, 2024

/s/ Adam D. Harber
Adam D. Harber

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

**GENTEX CORPORATION and INDIGO
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,**

Plaintiffs,

THALES VISIONIX, INC.,

Involuntary Plaintiff,

V.

META PLATFORMS, INC. and META
PLATFORMS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:22-cv-03892-YGR

PROPOSED ORDER

Date: February 13, 2024
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Courtroom 1, 4th Floor
Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Upon consideration of the joint motion to dismiss filed by Gentex Corporation; Indigo Technologies, LLC; Meta Platforms, Inc.; and Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC, it is hereby

ORDERED that all of the claims are **DISMISSED** with prejudice, and

FURTHER ORDERED that this case is **CLOSED**.

Dated:

Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
United States District Judge